

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-5 and 7-15 are currently being prosecuted. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider his rejection in view of the Remarks as set forth below.

Allowable Subject Matter

It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner considers the subject matter of Claims 12 and 13 as being allowable.

Entry of Amendment

It is respectfully requested that the present Amendment should be entered into the official file in view of the fact that the present response includes only arguments. Accordingly, entry of this Amendment and full consideration of the arguments is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious over the admitted prior art in view of Oh et al. (U.S. Patent 5,856,818). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner points out that the admitted prior art shows a quad type liquid crystal display having gate and data lines which define sub-pixel regions, gate driving integrated circuits and a plurality of data drive circuits. The Examiner cites Oh et al. to show that using more than three data drive IC's in a single bank structure is known. The Examiner admits that neither the admitted prior art nor Oh et al. discusses the  $(3n-1)$  channels for each data drive. The Examiner feels that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to spread out the floating channels for the entire drive in order to balance the device and prevent wasted liquid crystal between the substrates. Applicants disagree that the present claims are obvious.

As noted in the Remarks of the Amendment filed on May 4, 2004, which are hereby incorporated by reference, Applicants disagree that the claimed recitation of the floating channels is obvious. The claim now makes it clear that every third channel is floating. This is not merely to spread out the channels, but is used as part of the approach to obtain the specific polarity of the pixels as shown in the figures. An integrated circuit arrangement normally provides alternating polarity signals along consecutive lines. By having the center channel in each group of three channels being a floating channel, the first and third channels will have the same polarity and the first and third channels in the following group will also have the same polarity but opposite to the first group. Accordingly, the arrangement of the floating channel is not merely to spread these channels along the entire device, but rather to appear in a specific relationship of polarity in regard to the

desired signals. This is not seen nor suggested in either the admitted prior art or in the Oh et al. reference, as admitted by the Examiner. Further, Applicants submit that it would not be obvious thereover. Accordingly, claims 1 and 5 are considered to be allowable.

Claims 2-4, 7-11, 14 and 15 depend from these allowable claims, and as such are also considered to be allowable. In addition, these claims have other features of the invention, which make these claims additionally allowable.

#### Conclusion


In view of the above remarks, it is believed that the claims clearly distinguish over the patents provided by the Examiner, either alone or in combination. In view of this, reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all of the claims are respectfully requested.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert F. Gnuse (Reg. No. 27,295) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
James T. Eller, Jr., #39,538

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

 JTE/RFG/adt:sld  
3430-0164P